LBJ and The Oil-Gas Lobby, P. 3

Why Was This Revealing Article on Vietnam Never Published in English?

Our attention has been called to an article in the French magazine Réalités last May which has not been published in its English language edition, though of great interest to Americans. The article "Vietnam—A New Korea" was written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, who now edits a NATO publication, Atlantic Community. This article makes some interesting revelations (1) that Brigadier Gen. Edward A. Lansdale, ret., who helped Magsaysay defeat the Huks in the Philippines, favors a joint declaration by the U.S. and South Vietnam calling for an anti-Communist revolution in North Vietnam (2) that as Diem's military adviser from 1954 to 1956 Lansdale had already organized commando raids on the North, (3) that 3,000 Vietnamese, many natives of the North, had been trained in Special Forces for further action of this kind (4) that after some tentative attempts at "counter belligerency" the Kennedy Administration, over the objections of Assistant Secretary of State W. W. Rostow, called off the operations as "too difficult and too dangerous" but that (5) a number of American military chiefs still favor them. Mowrer also says he was informed that in September, 1963, Kennedy ordered Averell Harriman to draw up a plan of neutralization for South Vietnam by stages, beginning with the elimination of Diem. In our issue of August 24 we called attention to an article in Le Monde (Aug. 7) which said U.S. training of commando units against the North began in 1957, three years before the rebellion broke out. Mowrer dates them even earlier.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 34 OCTOBER 12, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

When That Chinese A-Bomb Does Go Off

Secretary Rusk made a generous contribution to the 15th anniversary of the Chinese Communist regime. His prediction that the explosion of China's first nuclear device was imminent gave Peking a birthday boost almost as resounding as would have been the nuclear blast itself. The failure of Peking to reciprocate by setting off a bomb must seem poor sportsmanship to our intelligence services. They have been consistently optimistic about China's nuclear potentialities. The Rand Corporation's leading necromancer on the subject, Alice Langley Hsieh, predicted in her "Communist China's Strategy in the Nuclear Age" (1962) that China might be expected to detonate its first atom bomb in 1962-63. Our propaganda agencies have been telling us for years (1) that China was on the verge of collapse and (2) that it was also on the verge of becoming a nuclear power. The loyal American could only conclude that Mao had hit upon some do-it-yourself shortcut, like that which turned out the home-made product known in our prohibition era as bathtub gin.

Ten Years Is No Eternity

The tone of the Rusk statement was splendid in its omnicompetence. "The United States," it said, "has fully anticipated the possibility of Peiping's entry into the nuclear weapons field and has taken it into full account in determining our military posture and our own nuclear weapons program." The Manchu Court in Peking must have been as complacent about the first penetrations of the Outer Barbarians into their empire. The press was told reassuringly in backgrounder briefings that before China had a sizeable stock of bombs and the means of delivering them on distant targets, it would be at least five years and more likely ten! Ten years are a mere tick of the clock in the history of China and ten years are very little time in which to adjust American thinking to a world in which China will also be a nuclear power.

The gravest decisions are just around the corner. Will we give nuclear arms to Chiang Kai-shek to deter atomic attack from the mainland, and how will we make sure he doesn't use them to set off the war he has so long desired? Will we encourage Japan to give up its renunciation of war and manufacture atomic bombs of its own, or accept them from us? And how will we be sure that the pacific Japan of today does not respond to the possession of this new military muscle by reverting to the aggressive Japan of yesterday, thirsting to revenge itself upon us for Hiroshima? Indonesia has already received Badger planes from the Soviet Union which can carry nuclear bombs. Will we compete for Sukarno's favor by being the first to provide bombs for them? Will impoverished India be encouraged to divert more food from its hungry millions to embark on the production of nuclear arms? We are approaching one of the decisive choices of human history. Will we continue to confront the new China with

(Continued on Page Two)

Another Way to Widen The War

". . . it is difficult to understand why some prominent officials, a few weeks before a national election should be talking so openly about expanding the war, and not only advocating but almost lobbying for such a course of action. It is even possible now to hear officials of this government talking casually about how easy it would be to 'provoke an incident' in the Gulf of Tonkin that would justify an attack on North Vietnam. . . . There is, of course, always a lot of casual talk here while major policies are in dispute, but this is an odd time and an odd way to proceed on anything so important as risking a war with China."

—James Reston, New York Times, October 2.

"Taipeh, Formosa (Associated Press)—Nationalist guerrilla raids on the China mainland will be stepped up, the Mainland Recovery Planning Board announced Sunday after a two-day meeting. Vice President Chen Cheng, the board's chairman, said measures also will be taken to incite anti-Communist revolts."

—Boston Herald, Sept. 28.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

hatred, and give new and more dangerous dimensions to the nuclear arms race? Or will we seek a Far Eastern settlement which would bring China back into the family of nations?

A Fresh Report from China

The average American has been led to believe that China's is a tottering regime which holds by terror alone 700 million hungry slaves. *Le Monde* (Sept. 18-Oct. 1) has just finished publishing a 12-part account by Robert Guillian of his first visit to China in seven years. Now, as in his past writings, Guillian has many misgivings about the regimentation and thought control in the new China. But he was impressed with the progress and self-confidence, particularly in mastering the tremendous difficulties created by the abrupt recall of Russian technicians and the ending of Soviet aid. A people which has been able to cope not only with the isolation forced on them by American power but with the body blow of the break with Moscow, is a people which feels it can overcome any obstacle. The bomb will be a symbol of their power to raise themselves by their bootstraps.

The delusions about China built up among the American people by 15 years of hateful propaganda are dangerous to our future and to world peace. McCarthyism was in large part the product of the China Lobby and a new rightist storm in our politics may some day be precipitated if leadership lacks the courage to provide saner and more humane views of China. A therapeutic and timely anthology of past misinformation has just been provided in Felix Greene's new book, "A Curtain of Ignorance" (see boxes on this page). Its most important chapter traces the way in which Chinese views have been distorted to make it appear that they would welcome nuclear war. Greene traces this back to a *New York Times* dispatch (June 16, 1958) which reported, "without mentioning names or places, Marshal Tito said the Chinese liked to boast that their population of 600,000,000 was a guarantee of victory in war. According to President Tito, Peiping calculated that 'if 300,000,000 were killed there would still remain 300,000,000 Chinese!' ". This was amplified and embroidered to the point where five years later a newspaper commentator was reporting that "Mao is said to have remarked in Moscow" that even if a third world war came and half the people of the world were killed, half of those who survived would be Chinese and they would rule the world. Scholarship has kept pace with journalism. One scholar cited by Greene quoted from Mao's writing to prove moral indifference to war but omitted a key sentence. In it Mao called war "this monster of mutual slaughter" and predicted its final elimination "through the progress of human society, and in no distant future." That is quite an omission. Not one American in a million knows that Mao expressed such a hope.

Clouded Crystal Ball Dept.

"What is happening in China is that the Soviet Union is detaching the northern provinces of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union."

—Secretary of State Dean Acheson to the National Press Club, Jan. 12, 1950.

"We can tell our friends in China that the U.S. will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them. We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be. The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavonic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the government of China. . . . It is not Chinese."

—Dean Rusk, then Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, May 18, 1951.

"[Walter S.] Robertson [Ass't Secy of State for Far Eastern Affairs 1953-59] had made no secret of his conviction that Mao Tse-tung was a passing phenomenon and Chiang Kai-shek remained China's 'real' symbol. Indeed in 1957 the affable Assistant Secretary assured me at a Washington party: 'Mao has no more real influence than the first taxi driver who goes by outside'."

—Felix Greene in his new book, "A Curtain of Ignorance" (Doubleday: $5.50) from which these quotations are taken. We recommend the book as a corrective to the poisonous nonsense on China in our press.

It's A Wonder There Are Any Chinese Left At All

1950: "Famine this year will be catastrophic" — New York Times editorial, March 26.

1951: "Food riots are reported among peasants"—U.S. News & World Report, March 16.

1952: "Shanghai is a city of hungry millions"—United Press from Formosa, June 23.

1953: "There is no hiding the fact that multiplied millions of Chinese are starving"—New York Times editorial, June 24.

1954: "Red China's leaders are already trying to prepare against the pressures of starvation"—Same, May 10.

1955: "Signs of a spring famine in Communist China are filtering from the mainland"—Ted Sculz in the New York Times from Hongkong, April 24.

1956: "Red China Beset by Spring Famine"—New York Times headline, March 27.

1957: "The threat of famine stalks millions of Chinese again this spring"—AP from Hongkong, May 13.

1958: "Peasants are deserting the collective farms. Cities are packed with hungry, jobless millions"—U.S. News & World Report, April 4.

1959: "Famished Red China slaves Steal Pigs' Slops"—headline, N.Y. World Telegram, Hongkong cable, June 25.

1960: "The hunger that stalks mainland China for the third straight year"—Time, Aug. 22.

1961: This was the banner year Joseph Alsop informed his readers (May 12) that the Chinese were reduced to dining on afterbirths and (Sept. 13) that the Communist government had put the population on a national diet averaging 600 calories a day, Felix Greene points out that the U.S. National Research Council says 709 calories a day is the absolute minimum to maintain a 2 to 6 months old 13-lb. baby!

1962: "The Chinese masses are now receiving a nationwide average of 1300 to 1600 calories a day . . . the figures raise the question whether Communist China is not caught in a remorselessly descending spiral from which a vast upheaval of some sort is the only likely escape."—Joseph Alsop, April 13.

1963: "March and April will be the months to watch. It is then that food stocks will be lowest. Unrest among Chinese peasants is expected. Revolts are likely"—U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 7.

—From Felix Greene's "A Curtain of Ignorance."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will LBJ As President Reject the Oil-Gas Lobby He Served As Majority Leader?

Proxmire Warns of Another Assault on Federal Regulation of Natural Gas

The oil and gas lobby is preparing its third assault on federal regulation of natural gas producers. This will be a test of President Johnson. As Senate leader, he engineered the two previous de-regulation bills through Congress. Truman vetoed the first and Eisenhower reluctantly vetoed the second when former Sen. Case disclosed a $2,500 offer for his vote. "Unfortunately," said Sen. Proxmire in a Senate speech (Sept. 25) that warned of the coming assault, "there is some doubt that similar bills would be vetoed at this time." A veto would be in striking contrast to the Democratic Platform which boasts that the spiral of natural gas prices in the 50's "has been halted by vigorous regulatory action" and "the Nation's 36 million consumers have benefited from rate reductions and refunds."

The Producers and the Pipe-Lines

FPC Chairman Swidler recently explained the need for federal regulation of gas producers. In a speech before the Independent Natural Gas Association, he spoke of "the dominating bargaining position of a handful of producers who control our major gas reserves." Although there are over 6,000 producers who sell interstate, the 23 largest accounted for 60% of total (interstate) pipeline purchases in 1962. These giant companies are also the nation's major oil companies. They are under no compulsion to sell natural gas because they have little funded debt and a very profitable oil business to sustain them. The pipeline companies, on the other hand, are under considerable compulsion to buy. They have large funded debts and billions of dollars invested in fixed facilities, which become wasting assets if gas is not kept flowing. Furthermore, the pipelines are tied to relatively limited producing areas and cannot move to other sources of supply. "Under these circumstances," said Swidler, "if producers were freed from regulation they could sit on their reserves until in desperation the pipelines met their terms."

The renewed attack on producer regulation comes when the FPC is about to abandon the idea of holding separate rate cases for each of the many thousands of gas producers. Instead it will fix a single price for an entire geographic area. Four area cases now underway will dispose of the rates for 75% of the gas flowing in interstate commerce. One danger with area rates is that they may bring windfall profits to the large companies whose costs tend to be below average while depriving the small high-cost firms of a fair return. As an alternative, the Supreme Court has suggested that the Commission regulate only the large producers.

If either system is adopted, it will provide the first effective regulation of producers since passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938. Until 1954 the Commission interpreted the Act to apply only to pipeline companies. In that year the Supreme Court reversed an FPC ruling and held that producer prices must also be regulated. (*Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin*, 342 U.S. 672.) The Eisenhower-appointed Commission recommended legislative relief from the Court's decision in annual reports from 1955 through 1960.

The Kennedy Commissioners may never get a chance to complete their work. There are already two vacancies on the five-man Commission. When he fills these, Johnson will have put his stamp on the majority. As Vice President, he influenced the choice of Commissioner Lawrence O'Connor, probably the only Texas oil executive to sit on the FPC.

What LBJ Said in 1956

"If the Senate sits supinely by and lets the Supreme Court write the laws of the nation, I warn Senators that if the Supreme Court can do it with respect to gas, it can do it also with respect to other commodities. If the Senate by inaction or by defeating the pending [Harris-Fulbright] bill, lets the Supreme Court say to the Texas farmer or to the Louisiana farmer or to the Texas Oil Co. or the Louisiana Oil Co., 'This is going to be the heyday of the price-fixers' and that the control contingent has come back to the Capital of the Nation, I warn every Senator that what applies to gas may apply to oil—they come out of the same hole, and that what applies to oil can apply to coal. If it can apply to coal, it can apply to butter and to autos and to everything that is produced. If we wish to follow our free enterprise system, we can say, 'We the Senate can entrust to reasonable men the duty of setting reasonable prices'."

—LBJ, in the Senate, Jan. 18, 1956.

How Public Utilities Conceal Aid To The Radical Right As Charity

"The nation's electric light and power industry is noted for its generous philanthropy. Not so well known, however, is the fact that many IOU's* give financial and leadership support to a host of reactionary, rightwing propaganda groups. I have just made a far-from-complete survey of this situation, which disclosed more than 200 instances of private power contributions to such groups.

"The great majority [of contributions]—84%—are for less than $500 each. Small donations are more easily concealed from regulatory agencies. Although FPC regulations require all IOU's to file an annual report of contributions and other expenditures, the Commission has not required itemization of donations under $1,000, and in many cases companies have been allowed to file reports in which nothing is itemized. The Commission originally proposed requiring that all donations in excess of $100 be itemized. The IOU's, however, objected and, as a result, the Commission backed off.

"In 1962, the private power industry's unitemized lump-sum (donations) totaled more than $15 million. Detroit Edison—the grand champion—reported $815,006 in unidentified lump-sum expenditures last year. I was able to obtain breakdowns of such expenditures from only 57 of the Nation's 220 private power companies. This is where I found most of the recent rightwing contributions—concealed in lump-sum expenditures labeled 'charitable contributions' and 'miscellaneous expenses.' The vast majority of (this) is included in the companies' operating expenses, so that the consumers—the public—wind up footing the bill.

"I think the American people have a right to know when their local power company supports group which for three decades have plastered the labels of 'socialism' and 'communism' on every legislative effort to ease pain and suffering, hunger and want, injustice and inhumanity."

—Sen. Metcalf (D. Mont.), in Cong. Rec., Sept. 25 (abr.).

* Investor Owned Utilities.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Footnote on Medicare's Defeat: U.S. Spending Relatively Less on Welfare Than in 1936

The Arms and Oil Lobbies Won Victories in The Rush to Adjourn Congress

The Civil Rights Act and the Equal Employment Opportunities Act—historic as is the achievement they represent—are only part of the story of the 88th Congress. A Senate speech by Clark (*D. Pa.*) in the closing hours helped to place these more spectacular accomplishments in perspective. "In terms of investment in our nation's wealth—roads, urban renewal, resource development, education and welfare," said Clark, "the United States stands at the bottom among the industrialized countries of the West." He pointed out that in the early 1960's we actually spent less annually (relative to GNP) on our domestic welfare than we did in 1936. This makes more damning Congress' failure to pass medicare and the Appalachian Development Program. The one compensation is that liberals will now have a chance to re-work these proposals, which are themselves so inadequate.

Private Sales of Arms

In the rush of adjournment, some unfortunate changes in major legislation went unnoticed. The arms and oil lobbies got the foreign aid conference committee to strike two salutary amendments. One, by Sen. Ellender, would have forbidden a new government program underwriting private sales of military equipment to foreign governments. The Defense Department justifies the guarantees as a way to cut down on public grants of military aid. To us they seem a way of increasing military aid behind the public's back. The other amendment, by Sen. Proxmire, would have put an end to a $35 million a year handout from AID to seven major international oil companies. The agency has been purchasing $100 million of oil annually at prices somewhere between 20% and 40% higher than the world market. The amendment required competitive bidding on all future purchases. Another indication of the power of oil may be seen in the restoration of aid to Indonesia. "The reason for the continuation," explained Sen. Morse, "is the investments of American oil companies there. We are constantly lulled with the theory that we have to preempt all the oil fields in the world to keep them from falling into Communist hands," he continued. "What we are really trying to do is extend our control over as much of the supply as possible in order to maintain an artificially high price for oil on the world market."

The Supplemental Appropriation Bill also contained disappointments. The House Appropriations Committee removed from it $1.9 million for a Public Health Service research and education campaign on the hazards of cigarette smoking. The Senate Committee might have restored the funds, but Health, Education and Welfare never filed the necessary petition. This is typical of the Department's timidity with big business, whether drugs or tobacco. It illustrates why the regulation of cigarette labeling should go to the Federal Trade Commission and not to HEW, as some tobacco-state Congressmen have been suggesting. Also missing from the Appropriation bill were funds for a $50 million rehabilitation loan program authorized in the Housing Act. The low-interest loans were to provide owners of deteriorating homes and businesses with an alternative to relocation, which often creates more slums. Apparently the real estate interests thought that rehabilitated dwellings would mar the beauty of their high-rise luxury apartments.

Unnoticed Contradiction

Rep. Jack WESTLAND (R. Wash.): I should like to talk about this matter of control of nuclear weapons. In reading many newspaper articles, you would think that the matter of giving any control or more say to NATO had never been discussed, that the President was always going to have the final, ultimate say on whether or not nuclear weapons were ever going to be used. If this is the case, then why has this administration so persistently urged this multilateral force, which would consist of members of NATO countries, Germans, Italians, Greeks, and Turks, all in the same ship with nuclear weapons, with Polaris weapons? Why would they persist in having this sort of NATO force if it is not to give NATO allies more control?

Rep. Craig HOSMER (R. Cal.): A great schizophrenia exists here between the MLF approach pursued by the administration on the international front and the zealous harboring of nuclear control which it pursues on the campaign trail.

—In the House, Sept. 22 (abr.).

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy of This Issue to A Friend If You Send A Long Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

10/12/64

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED